PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S #604 Everett, WA 98201 (425) 388-3311, FAX (425) 388-3670

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Snohomish County Planning Commission

FROM:

Gary Joleburg, Senior Planner by

Department of Planning and Development Services

DATE:

September 9, 2014

SUBJECT:

Snohomish County 2015 Capital Facility Plan (CFP)

Introduction

PDS staff will brief the planning commission on the proposed 2015 CFP on September 23. The planning commission must ultimately make a recommendation to the county council on adoption of the proposed 2015 CFP. A fully updated CFP and final staff report with findings will be submitted in advance of the October 7 public hearing for your consideration. The county council will consider the 2015 CFP along with the other proposed components of the 2015 comprehensive plan update.

Objectives of the CFP Briefing:

PDS staff will conduct a formal briefing for the planning commission with the following objectives:

- ✓ Review basic information from the study session on August 26, 2014.
- Discuss the current content of the proposed 2015 CFP highlighting revisions since the August study session.
- ✓ Detail the process of adoption of the proposed 2015 CFP.

Background

The GMA (36.70A.070 (3)) requires a capital facilities plan as a mandatory element of the comprehensive plan to ensure efficient delivery of facilities and services to the community in support of planned growth.

The Snohomish County CFP has four main components (pursuant to the GMA) that will be revised as part of the comprehensive plan update process:

- 1) An inventory of existing facilities plus the locations and capacities of current facilities.
- 2) A section that forecasts what capital facilities the county should need in the next 20 years based on meeting specified levels of service for a projected population (forecast of future needs).
- 3) The locations and capacities of existing facilities.
- 4) A summary of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) the six-year financing document that explains how new facilities will be funded and explanation of the relationship to the CFP.

The CFP identifies major public facilities provided directly by the county or by other public agencies serving unincorporated areas. It also forecasts what facilities the county should need during the next twenty years.

The GMA defines public services and public facilities in RCW 36.70A.030 as:

- (12) "Public facilities" include streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreational facilities, and schools.
- (13) "Public services" including, but not limited to fire protection and suppression, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and other governmental services.

The CFP is also an integral element of a comprehensive plan for cities and counties planning under the GMA:

36.70A.110(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated new fully contained communities as defined by RCW 36.70A.350.

2015 CFP Revisions - September Briefing

Several portions of the study session CFP document had placeholders at the time of the August study session. The following sections now contain complete and up-to-date information and will be discussed at the September 23 briefing:

✓ Surface Transportation has been updated with summaries of new information that will be in the Transportation Element. (The planning commission will receive a detailed briefing at its September 16 meeting.)

- ✓ Parks information has been completed with the selection of a preferred LOS methodology. The minimum LOS will be explained.
- ✓ The Surface Water Management has been augmented with information that is summarized for inclusion in the CFP.
- ✓ The Hazard Mitigation Planning section did not require substantial update.

cc: Stephen Clifton, AICP, Executive Director Clay White, Director, PDS Barb Mock, Manager, PDS Will Hall, AICP, Legislative Analyst, Council Staff